1 2 3 4 5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 6 AT SEATTLE 7 8 ISHOW.COM, INC., No. C15-1550RSL 9 Plaintiff, 10 ORDER GRANTING IN PART LENNAR CORPORATION, et al., **DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR** 11 CASE MANAGEMENT 12 Defendants. **CONFERENCE** 13 14 This matter comes before the Court on "Lennar Corporation and Lennar Pacific 15 Properties Management, Inc.'s Request for Telephonic Motion Hearing Pursuant to Local Rule 16 7(i) or, in the Alternative, Case Management Conference." Dkt. # 59. Granting defendants' alternative request for relief, the Court scheduled a pretrial conference and heard argument 17 18 regarding defendants' various case management suggestions on June 29, 2017. Being fully 19 apprised, the Court finds that there is substantial overlap between the legal and equitable claims asserted in this litigation and/or that there are factual issues that must be resolved by the jury 20 21 before the Court will consider whether equitable relief is appropriate.¹ 22 23 ¹ To the extent defendants are asserting that certain issues, such as laches, can be decided as a matter of law, the Court declines to entertain a summary judgment motion at this late date. The 24 dispositive motion deadline was January 31, 2017. Defendants waited almost three months after the 25 Court issued its summary judgment rulings to raise the possibility that they might be entitled to relief as

26

ORDER GRANTING IN PART DEFENDANTS'

MOTION FOR CASE MANAGEMENT

CONFERENCE

This case shall proceed to trial, as scheduled, on July 24, 2017. Liability and damage issues will be tried together. The Court will try the equitable issues with an advisory jury under Fed. R. Civ. P. 39(c)(1). In crafting their proposed jury instructions and verdict form, the parties shall include written questions designed to obtain from the jury any factual determinations necessary to a determination of equitable relief.

Dated this 30th day of June, 2017.

MNS Carnik

Robert S. Lasnik United States District Judge

a matter of law. This case has been delayed long enough, and defendants have not shown good cause for an extension of the dispositive motion deadline.